Assessing the Similarity of Injunctive Norm Profiles across Different Social Roles: The Effect of Closeness and Status in the USA and P. R. China

Emma E. Buchtel and Paolo P. L. Ma

The Education University of Hong Kong

Yanjun Guan

Durham University

Corresponding author:

Emma E. Buchtel

Department of Psychology

The Education University of Hong Kong

10 Lo Ping Road, Tai Po, Hong Kong SAR

buchtel@eduhk.hk

Declaration of Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship or publication

of this article.

Financial disclosure / funding:

The work described in this paper was supported by a grant from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (Project No. EdUHK 18608315).

Acknowledgements:

Gratitude for help with translations, coding, and manuscript preparation is given to Ann Yicun XIE, Viky Shuk Yee LAM, Vicky Hiu Kei TO, Aimee Zhuofan SUN, Frank Tian-fang YE, Vienne Man Ying WONG, and Michelle Yan Jun CHEN.

Abstract

Do social roles affect injunctive norms for behavior, and more so in Chinese than American cultural contexts? We examine open-ended data describing appropriate behavior for social roles that differ in interpersonal closeness and relative status. American (N = 401) and Chinese (N = 392) participants provided descriptions of ideal behavior of two actors in one of 16 role-dyads. The 2219 (American) and 1466 (Chinese) behavior descriptions were coded into 71 content categories, forming profiles of appropriate behavior for six social roles (Close/Distant x Low/Equal/High status). First, we adapt a method for assessing profile similarity in personality psychology (Biesanz, 2010, Furr, 2008) to quantitatively evaluate how closeness and status affect similarity between the six social roles. By separating similarity into *normative* (average behavior) and *distinctive* (behavior specific to a particular social role) components, we find that distinctive behavioral profiles for specific social roles vary systematically by closeness/status in both the American and Chinese data; we also find a larger effect of closeness in the Chinese data. Second, we qualitatively analyze the content of the distinctive behavioral profiles through the lens of the Rapport Management Model (Spencer-Oatey, 2000), showing how rights and obligations associated with each role vary, and finding cultural differences in which behaviors appropriately manage these expectations. Quantitative findings emphasize the cross-cultural importance of interpersonal situation for determining appropriate behavior, with some evidence for a greater effect in Chinese culture; qualitative results reveal the culturally-specific ways in which relational situations direct expectations for behavior. (244 words)

Keywords: injunctive norms; social roles; situations; culture; Rapport Management Model; normative and distinctive similarity

Assessing the Similarity of Injunctive Norm Profiles across Different Social Roles: The Effect of Closeness and Status in the USA and P. R. China

Despite the prima facia importance of the effect of situations on behavior, psychology research on behavioral norms associated with specific situations is rare and in need of development (Funder, 2016; Pettigrew, 2018; Takano & Osaka, 2018). Psychologists have only recently begun made advances in how to define situations so as to create tractable research questions about their effects (Guillaume et al., 2016; McAuley, Bond, & Kashima, 2002; Rauthmann & Sherman, 2016). In particular, the effects of social role—one's relationship vis-à-vis others in the situation—should be an important factor in determining behavior. This may be especially so in Confucian-heritage cultures, influenced by a Confucian Role Ethics emphasis on the moral relevance of acting appropriately for one's role (Buchtel et al., 2015, 2018; Rosemont & Ames, 2016). Yet, while cultural psychologists have classically argued that relationship-specific expectations are more differentiated and powerful guides for behavior in collectivistic cultures (e.g. Markus & Kitayama, 1991), large-scale cross-cultural personality research has found only ambiguous evidence for effects of culture or even social roles (e.g. Church, Alvarez, et al., 2012; Locke et al., 2017).

Do different social roles imply different norms for behavior, and how can we measure such dissimilarity? Cross-culturally, is there greater differentiation between social roles in Confucian-heritage cultures than others? These questions frame our analyses of open-ended data, from China and the USA, describing the unique "behavioral profiles" of social roles: Here, the profile of injunctive norms for behaviors associated with roles varying in status and closeness.

To measure differences between social roles, we adapt the paradigm of normative vs. distinctive aspects of personality profile similarity (Biesanz, 2010; Furr, 2008; Rogers, Wood, &

Furr, 2018) and apply it to similarity between appropriate behavior profiles for different social roles. This framework can help draw out role-specific effects on injunctive norms for behavior, and to uncover both cultural differences and similarities (Fischer & Poortinga, 2018) in how, and to what degree, social roles change these expectations. Finally, we qualitatively analyze the behavioral content of the role-distinctive profiles, using the framework of the Rapport Management Model (Spencer-Oatey, 2000) to shed light on how different requirements for social interactivity, equity, and face are reflected in the distinctive behavioral profiles of different roles.

Effects of Social Role on Behavior

While it is a truism that behavior changes according to different situations, psychological research on the effects of specific situations has been slowed by the empirical difficulty of defining "situation" (Funder, 2009; McAuley et al., 2002; Rauthmann, 2015). Lacking an overarching theory of situations to guide hypotheses (Church, Katigbak, & del Prado, 2010; Rauthmann, 2015), the study of person-situation interactions has mainly focused on personality rather than features of situations.

What aspects of situations are most important for directing behavior? In the sociolinguistics area of pragmatics, the effects of situation on effective communication is a classic research question, with many researchers focusing on effects of relational closeness and relative status (as proposed in Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory). Numerous studies of spoken and written communication have confirmed the important effects of closeness and status on behaviors such as speech forms, forms of address, and conflict management (e.g. see Spencer-Oatey, 2008). The two dimensions of closeness and status also appear in psychologists' studies of situations: For example, in a study of Hong Kong and Australian students' perceptions of 56 role dyads (McAuley et al., 2002), the first two factors reflected closeness (degree of affection and association) and equality (whether the dyads were equal or

not). Agency (akin to status) and communion are also reflected in the two underlying clusters of the Riverside Situational Q-sort (Rauthmann, 2016), an empirically based set of dimensions that describe psychologically salient aspects of situations (Rauthmann et al., 2014), and have been argued to be fundamental dimensions of social cognition (Abele & Wojciszke, 2014).

We suggest that relative to other aspects of situations, one's social role—in particular, relational status and closeness— should be salient and important across cultures. In this study, we thus ask how the closeness and status of social roles change expectations of behavior, that is, injunctive norms about how one *ought* to act (Buchtel & Norenzayan, 2008; Cialdini & Trost, 1998). We first hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Differences in social role (relational closeness and the relative status of actors) will be associated with different expectations for behavior, in both American and Chinese data.

Cultural Differences in Cross-Role Consistency of Injunctive Norms?

Cultural psychologists have classically argued that that due to the importance of social roles in collectivistic cultures, self-concept (and related behavior) should be less consistent across relational situations than that of members of individualistic cultures (Heine & Buchtel, 2009). For example, Japanese self-descriptions varied more depending on who was sitting nearby than did Americans' (Kanagawa, Cross, & Markus, 2001); Koreans' personality descriptions, both self-rated and informant-rated, varied more across relational contexts than did Americans' (Suh, 2002); and East Asian Americans rated their personality and other traits less consistently across two relationships (friend vs. mother) than did European Americans (English & Chen, 2007). However, large-scale cross-cultural personality research has only sometimes found more personality variability reported by participants from East Asian cultures (Ching et al., 2013; Church, Alvarez, et al., 2012; Church, Willmore, et al., 2012; Malloy, Albright, Diaz-Loving,

Dong, & Lee, 2004). Injunctive norms are rarely specifically assessed, and when assessed, as in Locke et al. (2017), find puzzling results such as a lack of differences between social roles and Japanese rating their personality as particularly dissimilar from injunctive norms. More research on cultural differences in injunctive norms for situations is needed.

In particular, the relational situation should be an especially important predictor of injunctive norms for behavior in Confucian heritage cultures due to the moral emphasis on both appropriateness and relational roles (Buchtel et al., 2015, 2018; Rosemont & Ames, 2016). In Confucianism, closeness and status are identified as the basic dimensions that define one's moral duties and responsibilities vis-à-vis others (Hwang, 2012). These dimensions were found to explain Taiwanese participants' similarity judgments of social roles (Chuang, 1998), and to be salient influences on Japanese communication choices (e.g. Moriizumi, 2016). Closeness vs. distance of relationships may be particularly important, as low relational mobility within collectivistic cultures leads to more salient ingroup-outgroup boundaries and differentiated responsibilities (Li, Li, & Li, 2018).

Thus, comparisons of Chinese and American open-ended descriptions of injunctive norms for behavior in different social roles should yield larger differences in Chinese descriptions of the ideal behavior of actors of different closeness or status. We hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 2 (H2): Closeness and status will affect injunctive norms for behavior to a greater degree in Chinese compared to American data.

Managing Rapport with Appropriate Behavior

What do appropriate behaviors communicate about the rights and obligations of actors of different social roles? What behavior is appropriate for some roles and cultures, but not others? In the discipline of pragmatics, Rapport Management Theory (e.g. Spencer-Oatey, 2000, 2002) extended Brown and Levinson's (1987) language-focused Politeness Theory to provide an

analytical framework for examining the appropriateness of interpersonal behaviors. Appropriate interpersonal interaction is expected to fulfill expectations for face (e.g. positive regard), equity (e.g. non-coercion), and (dis-)association rights (e.g. social interaction at the expected level of intensity and intimacy). Cultural differences in the behaviors that express their appropriate management could lead to problematic cross-cultural interactions (Spencer-Oatey & Xing, 2004). Qualitative analysis of the behaviors through this framework will allow us to generalize from specific behaviors to see how actors appropriately manage such expectations, and how this varies by role and culture. We thus expect that:

> *Hypothesis 3 (H3): The content of injunctive norms for behavior will show evidence of actors negotiating issues of* equity*,* association*, and* face *differently depending on social role and culture (Spencer-Oatey, 2000, 2002).*

Distinctive vs. Normative Similarity

Methodologically, how should we evaluate similarity between the expected behavior of social roles? In personality psychology, methods for assessing similarity between the personalities of individuals are well-developed (Rogers et al., 2018), but have rarely been applied to assessing similarity of situations (see Rauthmann & Sherman, 2017 for an exception).

A well-established problem in personality psychology is that similarity between any two personality profiles is affected by both person-specific and person-general components (see Rogers et al., 2018, for a review). Raw similarity is composed of two aspects (Biesanz, 2010; Furr, 2008): first, the similarity that arises because of how similar both profiles are to any "average" profile (called the *normative* profile), and second, similarity between the two profiles' *distinctive* features, that is, their profiles after subtracting or controlling for the normative profile. For example, marital couples' personality trait profiles are on average positively correlated; but examining their *distinctive* personality profiles is necessary to determine if married couples are

any more similar than an *average* pair of strangers (Furr, 2008).

Appendix 2 illustrates the application of this paradigm to the current data. Here, we are not analyzing similarity between individuals, but rather between social roles. Our parallel question is whether the profile of injunctive norms for one social role is similar to that of another social role, and if similarity decreases for roles of more different closeness/status. Raw similarity between the profile of acceptable behaviors of different social roles could be high; but to what extent is that because of common, *normative* behavior that is generally acceptable (for example, anyone sitting with someone else in a restaurant is quite likely to discuss the weather, and somewhat likely to discuss work/school)? Are there some behaviors that are *distinctively* appropriate for certain social roles more than others (for example, relative to the average, a close and higher-status grandmother may be much more likely to ask her granddaughter about school life rather than the weather, while strangers would do the opposite)? Differences and similarities between roles (H1/H3) should become clearer if we disentangle role-distinctive from normative (average) behavior, enabling us to see which behaviors are distinctively appropriate for roles differing in closeness and status. Conversely, the similarity of the normative profile to that of role-specific profiles can also help test if behavior in specific roles is more different from average behavior in Chinese compared to American cultural contexts (H2).

The Current Study

To assess if having a close or distant relationship, and being high, low, or equal in status, affect injunctive norms for behavior, we elicit descriptions of appropriate behavior between dyads from participants in the USA and China. Content analysis of these open-ended descriptions allows us to determine the profile of expected behavior for actors of six social roles (Close/Distant crossed with High/Equal/Low status). We then adapt the distinctive vs. normative framework to assess similarity and qualitative content of social role-specific profiles of

injunctive norms.

We find that distinguishing between normative and distinctive profiles helps highlight both cultural and role effects. In particular, the distinctive profiles highlight how injunctive norms change in both cultures depending on relational closeness and status. These distinctive profiles of injunctive norms for each social role can then be analyzed qualitatively to show how the management of rights and obligations (Spencer-Oatey, 2000, 2002) within relationships changes depending on dyad closeness and status differences.

Procedure

Scenarios and questions were presented in Chinese to the Chinese participants, and English to the American participants. Translations between English and Chinese were carried out through discussion and repeated backtranslation by the authors, who are fluent or conversant in both languages.

Scenario design. Drawing on role dyads that have been shown in previous research to vary on interpersonal distance and status equality (Chuang, 1998; McAuley et al., 2002), we designed 16 scenarios in which two people were interacting in a neutral setting: eating lunch at the same table in a restaurant (see Appendix 1 for all scenarios). Role pairs were chosen to differ maximally in closeness (from strangers to close friends / family members) and equality (from equal to unequal relational status). Each of the 16 scenarios described a dyad of either a higher-status and lower-status person (unequal dyads), or two equal-status persons (equal dyads), crossed with closeness, resulting in 4 close-unequal dyads (e.g. grandfather and grandson); 4 distant-unequal dyads (e.g. boss and secretary from a different department); 4 close-equal dyads (e.g. old high school classmates); and 4 distant-equal dyads (e.g. shop workers from different shops). These 16 role pairs were primarily drawn from the 56 dyads rated in McAuley et al. (2002), selecting dyads that had been viewed as similarly equal (or unequal) by both Hong Kong

and Australian participants. For assessment of closeness we also drew on Chuang (1998), where Taiwanese adults and university students rated 28 role pairs' similarity on closeness-distance and dominance-submission. As we made some adjustments to dyads (e.g. changing children to be adults) in order to prevent obvious differences in their abilities from affecting behaviors, we also re-tested closeness and status in our study.

Each specific actor in a dyad was thus categorized as one of six social roles: 3 status levels (high, equal, low) crossed with 2 closeness levels (close, distant). Role pairs were always same-sex, adult, and non-hostile, with two male pairs and two female pairs representing each closeness/equality quadrant. The 16 short scenarios (see Appendix 1) gave minimal but sufficient information about the relationship and situation; e.g. "Imagine a GRANDFATHER and his GRANDSON together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. The grandson is 25 years old and has a job."

Participants. Adult participants from the USA and the People's Republic of China (PRC) completed online surveys in English and Chinese respectively. Participants were recruited from similar national online platforms (MTurk in the USA and SoJump in the PRC) for payment (PRC: 9RMB (US$1.30), USA: US$2).

Data was sought from 20-30 American and Chinese participants respectively for each of the 16 role-pair scenarios[1]; each participant was randomly assigned to only one role dyad. As shown in Table 1, an average of about 25 participants rated each role-pair in the American and Chinese data respectively, resulting in data from approximately 100 participants per culture for each Closeness/Equality quadrant (401 USA and 392 Chinese participants in total). The

[1]Participant numbers were planned to provide adequate data for situation sampling (e.g. Morling et al., 2015). We estimated that 20 participants for each of 4 dyads, providing a minimum of 2 behaviors per actor, would provide an adequate pool of a minimum of 20*2*4 = 160 behavioral examples per role. Participants were randomly assigned to role dyads. Collection stopped when the minimum of 20 participants for all dyads had been reached.

American and Chinese participants were comparable on several demographic variables: Participants were 54% (USA) / 48% (PRC) male, USA M_{age} = 34.77 years (range 19-72) / PRC M_{age} = 32.52 (range 20-68), and 67% (USA) / 69% (PRC) participants were bachelor degree holders or currently attending university or college. An additional 5 American participants' data were excluded as they had lived in the USA for less than 7 years, and 14 participants' data (1 USA, 13 PRC) were excluded for nonsensical open-ended responses. For the open-ended data analysis, an additional 20 Chinese participants' data were excluded as their open-ended data indicated misunderstanding of the questions, but as inclusion or exclusion of these participants did not affect closed-ended data analysis they were retained in those analyses.

Measures.

Open-ended Appropriate behavior. Immediately after reading the description of a given situation, participants were asked to describe appropriate behavior of each actor in the dyad, for example, "How should the *grandfather [grandson]* act towards *his grandson [his grandfather]* in this situation? Please list 2-4 things that the *grandfather [grandson]* should do that would be appropriate. It could be body language, something he says, or something he does."[2]

Closeness and Equality of role dyads. To confirm the applicability of dyads to their expected quadrants, participants rated how close and equal the dyad were on two questions, e.g.: "In your opinion, rate how close the grandfather and grandson are," on a 7-point Likert-type scale labeled from *very distant* to *very close*; and "In your opinion, rate how equal in status the grandfather and grandson are" (in Chinese: "...rate how equal the relationship is between...") on a

[2] We additionally asked participants to describe a behavior that one role actor should do but the other one should not do; this data has not yet been analyzed. After the open-ended questions, we also asked participants about ideal personality expression, which will not be described in this article due to topic and space constraints; and we asked participants to rate how likely actors would be to carry out other specific behaviors (talkativeness, emotional expressivity, anger expression, success sharing); as these are descriptive rather than injunctive norms, they are not described here.

7-point Likert-type scale labeled from *very unequal* to *completely equal*.

Data preparation (Open-ended Data)

Coding. After separating participants' descriptions into specific behaviors, 2219 (American sample) and 1466 (Chinese sample) behaviors were available for coding. On average, each participant provided about 2-3 behaviors per character (i.e. ~1% of the behaviors describing a given social role). A coding scheme was developed by two bilingual coders (including the second author), blind to hypotheses[3], through an iterative, atheoretical process aimed to provide an accurate description of the behaviors in the dataset. Behaviors that were mentioned more than 5 times in the whole dataset were given their own code (see Online Table 1 at https://tinyurl.com/osf-supp-jccp2019 for entire coding scheme with examples). The final coding scheme of 71 categories (as well as "uncodable") was applied to all behaviors by the second author and a new bilingual coder blind to hypotheses, with 94.5% agreement. Final disagreements were resolved in discussion with the first author.

Calculation of Raw, Normative and Distinctive profiles. The frequency of each behavioral code for each of the 6 roles (Close / Distant crossed by High / Equal / Low status) was assessed by calculating the percentage of behaviors within that role[4] that were assigned to a given behavior code, resulting in a (1) *raw* injunctive norm profile (across the codes) of the frequency with which each behavioral code was mentioned for each social role (e.g. see Appendix 2).

To analyze main effects of closeness/status, we (2) calculated separate "normative"

[3] While scenario and language/culture context were necessary to understand participants' descriptions, coders were explicitly required to not use the scenario context to interpret behavioral meaning, and to avoid codes reflecting only language-specific phrasing of behaviors.

[4] Because each participant described both actors in one dyad, we obtained approximately twice as much open-ended data about equal-status characters (2 per each of 8 scenarios) than we did for high- or low-status characters (1 per each of 8 scenarios). Transforming code frequencies into percentages does not affect correlations, but helps us directly compare behavior frequencies across the equal-status vs. high- or low-status roles, as in Table 4.

profiles for Close, Distant, High status, Equal status, and Low status roles; for example, the Close Normative profile is the average of three Close raw profiles across status (Close-High status; Close-Equal status; and Close-Low status) from the given culture.

The (3) *overall normative* profile was calculated per culture by calculating the average percentage for each code across the 6 roles' raw profiles, thus reflecting the culture's average profile of injunctive behavioral norms regardless of the role of the actor.

Finally, to create (4) *distinctive* profiles for each social role (as in Biesanz, 2010; Furr, 2008), for each culture separately, we subtracted the overall normative profile from the raw profile of each role, creating six role-specific distinctive profiles for each culture.[5]

Results

Closeness and Equality ratings of role dyads. Participants' ratings of the dyads' relational closeness and equality were examined to confirm that that in both cultures, dyads were perceived to differ on status equality and closeness as planned. As shown in Table 1, average ratings of Closeness and Equality for each of the 16 scenarios indicated that for both Chinese and American participants, each role dyad scenario fell within its predicted quadrant (that is, above or below the relevant overall average closeness or equality rating) with the exception of the Chinese participants' Equality rating of the mother and daughter dyad (rated 5.44, falling above the average of 5.28). The average closeness rating of the 8 distant and 8 close dyads were significantly different in both cultures (Americans: M_{diff} = 2.02 (*SE* = .12), t (398) = 16.67, p < .001, d = 1.67 [1.52, 1.82]; Chinese: M_{diff} = 1.74 (SE = .12), t (390) = 14.91, p < .001, d = 1.50 [1.36, 1.64]). The average equality rating of the 8 unequal and 8 equal pairs was also

[5] Raw, Normative and Distinctive profiles across all codes shown in Online Table 2 at https://tinyurl.com/osf-supp-jccp2019

significantly different in both cultures, Americans, M_{diff} = 2.38 (SE = .13), t (399) = 17.81, p < .001, d = 1.77 [1.62, 1.93]; Chinese, M_{diff} = .96 (SE = .13), t (390) = 7.39, p < .001, d = 0.75 [0.63, 0.86], although the difference was unexpectedly larger for Americans than Chinese.[6] In this context, and as the mother-daughter dyad had been rated by Hong Kong participants (McAuley et al., 2002) to be highly differentiated on equality, we retained our original categorization of the mother and daughter roles as being high and low status respectively.

Correlational analysis of coded open-ended data. To eliminate behaviors that were not applicable for a given culture, only codes for behaviors that were observed more than 3 times in that culture were retained. This resulted in social role profiles across 56 codes for within-China analyses, and 61 codes for within-USA analyses.[7] As the frequency of behavior codes across the profiles were non-normally distributed, Spearman's rho correlations were used, which analyze the rank order of behavior-code frequencies. When averaging across correlations, correlations were first subjected to Fisher's Z transformations.

Plan for correlational analysis. Similarity between the six social roles was then assessed by correlations between behavioral profiles, addressing Hypotheses 1 and 2. (1) First, *raw* profile correlations show us the general pattern of closeness and status effects on similarity. (2) Second, similarity between the average profiles of close versus distant roles, and then roles of different

[6] In hindsight this may have been due to the phrasing of the Chinese question, which asked how *equal* the relationship was, an adjustment made because using the word "status" （地位）in the Chinese question sounded excessively unnatural, especially for close dyads. Chinese participants may thus have been rating whether there was an imbalance of coercive power, rather than to what degree one side could expect respect from the other in the classical Confucian sense. The difficulty in finding equivalent ways of explicitly asking the status question in Chinese and English may reflect the complexity of defining the "power/status" dimension of interpersonal relations, especially across cultures (Spencer-Oatey, 1996).

[7] The "base rate"—i.e. number of behavior codes used in the correlation analyses—is an important consideration here because behaviors that are quite infrequent in one role, but frequent in another, affects similarity. For the analyses here, we included codes that were mentioned at least 3 times within culture even if they were infrequent behaviors for a certain social role, because within the realm of behaviors that one could acceptably engage in at a restaurant, avoiding behaviors that one should not do in that particular relational situation could be as important as performing the ones that one should do.

status (high/equal/low), is compared to test for cultural and main effects of closeness and status on profile similarity. (3) Third, the similarity between the *overall normative* profile and raw role profiles is examined to test if there are cultural differences in how "average" role-specific behavior is. (4) Fourth, the *distinctive* role profiles are compared to test if there are similar and systematic effects of closeness and status in both cultures (see Appendix 2 for illustration).

(1) Raw profile similarity. Before breaking down the raw frequency profiles into normative and distinctive profiles, we examine the raw frequency profiles for comparison. In Table 2, within-culture Spearman's correlations between the raw frequency profiles show some evidence of both cultural differences and also effects of closeness vs. status.

Some general observations can be made, but specific cultural and role comparisons are not statistically significant. Role profiles within culture were often positively correlated, perhaps due to common normative similarity of acceptable behavior across roles. There was a general pattern of greater profile similarity in the American than the Chinese data; in the USA data nine out of 15 comparisons were significantly positively correlated, an average of $\bar{r}_s(61) = .41$ [.178, .600], $p = .001$ across all comparisons (ranging from a low of .08 to a high of .78), while only six were significantly positively correlated in the Chinese data, an average of $\bar{r}_s$ (56) = .19 [-.072, .434], *ns* (ranging from -.21 to .62), non-significantly smaller than the average correlation within the American data ($z = 1.28$, $q = .24$, *ns*). In both cultures, the distant roles' raw profiles were all significantly positively correlated with one another, and close roles' raw profiles were all significantly positively correlated with one another, suggesting that in both cultures, behavior between people of similar closeness but different status is similar. Moreover, in both cultures, the correlations between close and distant roles' raw profiles appeared generally weaker, suggesting that close and distant roles were dissimilar on average. The pattern for status was less clear, suggesting that there was not a strong effect of status that generalized across close and distant

roles.

(2) Profile similarity of Close- vs. Distant Normative; Low vs. High vs. Equal Normative. Is there a different "role profile template" for roles that differ in closeness or status, that is more different in Chinese compared to American data (H2)? We find evidence for a main close vs. distant role effect that is stronger for Chinese than Americans, but no evidence for a main effect of status (disregarding closeness). A correlation between the profile average of three close roles (Close Normative) and the profile average of three distant roles (Distant Normative) was non-significant for Chinese, $r_s(56) = -.17$ [-.411, .100], *ns*, while it was significantly positive for Americans, $r_s(61) = .30$ [.054, .513], $p = .018$, indicating that close and distant roles were less similar for Chinese than Americans, $z = 2.53$, $q = .48$, $p = .012$). The profile averages of the two High-status, Equal-status, and Low-status roles respectively, however, were all positively correlated and not significantly weaker in Chinese ($\overline{r_s}(56) = .37$ [.117, .575], $p = .005$) than American data ($\overline{r_s}(61) = .62$ [.440, .755], $p < .001$)), cultural comparison $z = 1.04$, $q = .34$, *ns*.

But what are the injunctive norms that are unique to a given social role? Next, we turn to a separate analysis of the overall normative and distinctive profiles.

(3) Overall Normative profile. The overall Normative profile for each culture indicates what behaviors were common across all roles (see Appendix 2 for illustration). As a second assessment of if there are cultural differences in the degree to which roles affect behavior (H2), we also examined if role-specific profiles are similar to the "average" behavior profile, by calculating the correlation of each role's raw behavioral profile with the culture's overall normative profile. The average correlation of the six raw role profiles with overall Normative was significantly positive in both cultures and not significantly larger in the American data (average $\overline{r_s}(61) = .67$ [.500, .786], $p < .001$) than in the Chinese data (average $\overline{r_s}(56) = .49$ [.262, .667], $p < .001$) ($z = 1.41$, $q = .28$, *ns*. Similarly, the absolute value of the raw profiles'

percentage difference from the normative profile was only marginally larger in the Chinese data (M = 1.38% (SD = 1.77) across the 56 codes), versus M = 0.94% (SD = .87) across the 61 codes of the American data, t (115) = 1.76, d = .32, p = .08. This suggests that in both cultures, a large proportion of variance in behavioral frequency in different roles could be attributed to what people ought to do "on average;" there was not strong evidence of a more common core of "average" behavior across roles in the American data than the Chinese data.

(4) Distinctive profiles. The Distinctive profiles for each role describe the injunctive norms unique to a role, relative to the average (see Appendix 2). Do they differ systematically depending on closeness and status (H1)? In Table 3, we show correlations, within-culture, of each Distinctive profile with the Distinctive profiles of other roles. These distinctive profiles show more clearly that in both cultures, social roles change what kind of behavior is appropriate, in a pattern that sensibly reflects both closeness and (to a lesser extent) status differences. As detailed below, the distinctive profile correlations show large effects of Distance vs. Closeness in both cultures, and effects of Status within the Close roles but less among the Distant roles.

Most noticeably, distant and close roles' distinctive profiles were significantly negatively related to one another in both cultures; for Chinese data, the average across nine distant/close role correlations was $\bar{r}_s(56)$= -.43 [-.622, -.189], p < .001, similar to the USA average of $\bar{r}_s(61)$ = -.42 [-.609, -.192], p < .001.

We find suggestive evidence for an interaction between closeness and status, as different-status *close* roles were not similar to one another, while different-status *distant* roles were relatively similar to one another. The three close roles' distinctive profiles were on average not significantly correlated across status (average among three Close role correlations: PRC $\bar{r}_s(56)$ = .20 [-.066, .439], *ns*, USA $\bar{r}_s(56)$ = .12 [-.131, .365], *ns*). Conversely, the three distant roles' distinctive profiles were on average positively correlated across status (average among three

Distant role correlations: PRC $\bar{r}_s(56) = .47$ [.242, .655], $p < .001$, USA $\bar{r}_s(61) = .39$ [.155, .584], $p = .002$). However, the difference was not significant in either culture (PRC: $z = 1.58$, $q = .31$, $p = .11$, USA: $z = 1.57$, $q = .29$, $p = .12$).

Finally, examining the effects of status within the close roles, correlations suggested that the Close, Equal roles (close friends) had a unique profile compared with other close roles. In both cultures, Close-High and Close-Low distinctive profiles were significantly positively correlated, and in turn were both significantly negatively correlated with all Distant roles (average of 6 correlations: PRC $\bar{r}_s(56) = -.56$ [-.72, -.35], $p < .001$; USA $\bar{r}_s(61) = -.54$ [-.69, -.33], $p < .001$). On the other hand, in both cultures the Close-Equal role profile was not very similar to either the Close-Low or Close-High roles (average of two correlations: PRC $\bar{r}_s(56) = .09$ [-.175, .346], *ns*, USA $\bar{r}_s(61) = .03$ [-.221, .281], *ns*) nor dissimilar to the three Distant roles (average of three correlations: PRC $\bar{r}_s(56) = -.12$ [-.367, .152], *ns*, USA $\bar{r}_s(61) = -.15$ [-.388, .104], *ns*). This suggests that among the Close roles, it was the unequal, family dyad roles whose appropriate behavior was most different from that of Distant roles, while the equal friend relationships are not as strongly similar to either other Close roles or Distant roles, seemingly a category unto themselves.

Summary of correlational analyses. The correlational analyses of the distinctive profiles shows clearly that in both cultures, uniquely role-specific distinctive behavior exists (H1); that is, we can see that both cultures have role-specific rules for how to behave, which vary systematically according to closeness and (to a lesser extent) status. We found weaker evidence for cultural differences in the strength of role effects (H2). The average behavior of Chinese Close roles was more different from Distant roles than they were in the American data, a large effect ($q = .48$), but other comparisons of cultural differences in role effects were not statistically significant. There were only trends towards greater overall raw profile similarity in the American

than Chinese data (q = .24 for the comparison), a trend towards a larger status main effect in the Chinese than American data (q = .34), and trend towards higher similarity of raw profiles to Normative profile in the American than Chinese data (q = .28 and d = .32 for cultural differences in correlations and percentage different respectively). Notably, after removing the normative profile, the social role effects on distinctive profiles were very similar in the Chinese and American data.

Qualitative analysis of open-ended distinctive profiles. Beyond the specific behaviors of a restaurant lunch, what does the content of these injunctive norms imply about relational obligations and appropriate interaction? To address H3, we qualitatively analyze the distinctive behaviors for each role (Table 4). Spencer-Oatey (2000, 2002) proposed that across cultures, interpersonal rapport depends on fulfilling expectations of appropriately showing respect for others (called *face*) and fulfilling expectations for sociality rights, such as the right to not be inappropriately imposed upon or coerced (*equity* rights), right to appropriate involvement in social interaction (*interactive association* or *disassociation* rights), and rights to appropriately implied intimacy (*affective association* rights). To the extent that cultural differences exist in the rights and obligations that are afforded by different social roles, greater potential for cross-cultural misunderstandings exist. Below, we briefly apply this analysis to Chinese, American, and then comparison data, showing how roles' distinctive injunctions reflect the rights and obligations of each social role.

Chinese distinctive injunctive norms. Table 4 shows that in comparison to normative profile behavior, the expected distinctive behavior of Chinese in the high/low status close dyads (all family relationships) is characterized by caring gestures such as putting food on the other's plate ("serve food to the other") or *guanxin*-ing the other (reminders to dress warmly, etc.); these are not a feature of equal dyad (friend) interactions, who, on the other hand, do provide small

acts of help for one another (pouring water, etc.). These behaviors could be interpreted as impositions on personal agency, and yet are apparently highly appropriate within close, high/low status family roles, suggesting that *equity* rights (the right to not be imposed upon or coerced) may be purposefully deemphasized; in fact, the very invasiveness of the behavior may be interpreted as indicating a high level of responsibility for and caring for the other. On the other hand, all close dyads are encouraged to converse and are not (i.e. much less likely than average) expected to interact minimally, showing the distinct difference in expectations of *interactional* association vs. dissociation rights for, respectively, close vs. distant relationship behavior. It is interesting to note that each actor should introduce conversation topics that seem more relevant to the other person: elders are particularly enjoined to ask about work, school, or romantic relationships; youngsters to ask about health; while equal dyads are more likely than the normative profile to converse about work, school, life in general, and reminisce about the past. The fact that specific topics are assigned to specific roles may also reflect the degree of intimacy and self-disclosure expected from different roles (*affective* association), as well as appropriate attentiveness to the interests of one's interlocutor.

For Chinese distant roles, on the other hand, the most common distinctive behavior is to interact minimally, reflecting the *interactional disassociation* rights as described above, although distant equal status roles are sometimes allowed to begin to build up a future relationship (e.g. introduce oneself, make small talk). Among distant roles there is also a distinctive lack of injunction to serve food, *guanxin*, or pour water for the other, which might be interpreted as assuming too much intimacy (implying the right of *affective disassociation*). In unequal dyads, giving *face* to the other seems to be a concern, expressed differently by high- and low-status roles: high-status strangers should politely offer (or ask for) a seat, while the low-status stranger could ask for advice.

American distinctive injunctive norms. Close roles in the American data, like that of Chinese close roles, reflect high expectations for *interactional association*. American Close actors are expected to converse, and again assigned to introduce conversation topics of interest to the other member of the role dyad: older family members should introduce conversation about work or school, younger family members should talk about "how life is going," and equal-status friends should talk about family and friends. In high/low dyads, *face* and *equity* seem to be a concern, with older family members expected to treat the other as an equal, and say they are proud of him/her; younger family members should "be respectful," and take advice. Older family members are also expected to give advice, and younger roles to offer to pay the bill, which, echoing the Chinese high/low close roles, suggest an expectation of being vulnerable to threats to *equity*. Equal-status, close friends are expected to provide *affective interaction* as indicated by making eye contact, thus communicating interest and intimacy. Differently from the high/low status roles, friends are less likely to be expected to be respectful or polite, instead being expected to laugh and joke around; this suggests an expectation of enhancing mood through cheerfulness rather than directly praising *face.*

Across the American Distant roles *disassociation* rights are most emphasized, similar to that of the Chinese Distant roles, with minimal interaction or only making small talk highly advised, although distant-equal pairs are also allowed to get to know each other (indicating the possibility of increased intimacy in the future). Distant roles were expected to converse casually while also avoiding getting "too personal," suggesting a difficult balance between some rights to *interactional association* while also rights to avoid *affective* (intimate) interaction. In all distant relationships, there is a distinctive expectation to *not* offer to pay the bill, indicating that this would be a role violation.

For the Distant, high-status roles, Americans seem to give curiously contradictory advice.

High status strangers should act professional but also relaxed; interact minimally but be polite; be friendly and nice, but not laugh. This may reflect anxiety about potential threats to a low-status strangers' *face*, solved by communicating concern for both the *equity* rights (e.g. by acting relaxed and polite, indicating no intention to coerce) and *disassociation* rights of low-status strangers. Low status strangers are expected to respect the others' *face* (by being respectful and polite) and *affective/interactional disassociation* rights, by interacting minimally, being formal, and not conversing about relationships, life, or work/school.

Chinese vs. American injunctive norms. From the above analysis, we can see that in both cultures, distant and close roles are expected to protect association/disassociation rights respectively, and unequal dyads' appropriate behavior shows or introduces concerns about equity and face. But across cultures, the kind of behavior that communicates appropriate management of these concerns may be quite different.

In family situations, for example, in both cultures the younger family member is expected to show care and respect to the elder; but while in Chinese data this is indicated by serving food, providing help, and caringly nagging the other e.g. about her health, in American data younger family members are expected to offer to pay the bill and generally "be respectful." Similarly, both Chinese and American older family members show care for the other's face; Chinese older family members by letting the younger choose the communal meal, while American older family members "treat the other as an equal" and explicitly praise him/her.

Similarly, injunctive norms of how to treat friends in both cultures include conversation about personal life, but while American friends are additionally expected to act happy and joke around, Chinese friends are likely to reminisce about the past. Friends may play a special role in both cultures, expressed in restaurant behavior as being active conversation partners but not obliged to take care of others in the way that family relationships may require, e.g. less need to

offer food (Chinese) or be polite and respectful (American).

Finally, strangers in both Chinese and American data are in the awkward position of sitting intimately with a stranger. In the Chinese context, this conflict is solved with a very salient expectation of *disassociation*; indeed, across Chinese distant roles, in the raw data 21%-25% of the injunctions were simply "minimal interaction." Among American strangers in the same situation, however, there seems to be a difficult expectation of engaging in some interaction, while balancing opposing concerns for *face*, *equity*, and *affective disassociation* (not appearing unfriendly or contemptuous, but also not too chummy).

General Discussion

Applying quantitative and qualitative methods to the study of profiles of expected behaviors for different social roles, we found effects of both social role and culture on injunctive norms for behavior. The findings illustrate how the personality psychology paradigm of normative vs. distinctive profiles can help draw out differences between social roles, and also how a focus on two main relational aspects of the situation—specifically, interpersonal closeness and status— helps us observe important effects of situations on behavior across cultures.

First, we hypothesized that closeness and status would affect similarity of profiles (H1). H1 was supported by the quantitative analysis of distinctive role profiles—behavior that is unique (relative to the normative profile) for each role— where both Americans and Chinese data displayed strikingly similar effects of social role: Distant and Close roles' profiles were highly dissimilar, and status changed behavior within Close roles. These distinctive profiles suggested that relational closeness and distance strongly affected interaction norms in both cultures, while the effects of status were more dependent on whether the dyads were close are not. We also hypothesized that closeness and status effects would be larger in the Chinese than American data (H2). H2 was partially supported; while there were only statistically non-significant trends

towards greater status effects in the Chinese data and more raw similarity across roles in the American data, support for H2 was found in a larger effect of Close vs. Distant roles on profile dissimilarity in the Chinese compared to American data.

In addition to the correlational analyses, we applied the qualitative framework of the Rapport Management Model (Spencer-Oatey, 2000) to the open-ended descriptions. This allowed us to interpret the social meaning of the distinctive behaviors, finding that dyads' management of face and sociality rights (e.g. expressing the correct level of intimacy, respect, and level of concern for equity) depends on the closeness and relative status of dyads (H3). These descriptions provided generalizable insights, such as the finding that equity rights may be of less concern in intimate family relationships. Yet, the specific behaviors that communicate the appropriate management of such concerns are often different in the American and Chinese data, emphasizing the importance of being culturally aware of what a given behavior may imply. For example, behaviors that are especially distinctive to certain roles may serve a symbolic function; e.g. among Chinese behaviors, placing food in another's bowl is specific to relationships that are close and unequal in status, and thus may be employed in other situations as a gesture of both intimacy and respect.

Normative and Distinctive Profiles as Applied to Social Roles

The distinctive profiles provided more specific insights into role effects than did the raw profiles, and suggest that this is a promising route for analysis of similarity of behavior across social roles. But as we adapt the Normative vs. Distinctive paradigm— commonly used to analyze personality data— to analyses of coded, open-ended data of six social roles with some large role-based differences in appropriate behavior, it is important (and interesting) to note how the meaning of "normative" changes. In personality psychology research, a normative profile of traits is also usually "normal:" Constructed as the average ratings on traits of hundreds of

participants, the normative profile will be a pattern of traits that is representative of an average (and, generally, good) person (Rogers & Biesanz, 2015). In this study, with large differences in the appropriateness of some behaviors for specific social roles, the normative behavioral profile—the average across the social roles—may not represent a "normal" person at all. This is most apparent in the Chinese data, where the normative behavioral profile (Table 4) includes behaviors that would be unlikely to be carried out by the same person (e.g. minimal interaction, but also serving food and *guanxin*-ing the other). This abnormal normative profile reflects the cultural difference we hypothesized: That Chinese social roles are more markedly different, with relatively role-differentiated and stereotyped behaviors. Among American data, however, the normative profile seems to indicate a common set of behaviors, one that you might follow without much fear of causing offence regardless of your social role.

In both cultures, the methodological advantage of subtracting the "normative" profile is that it accentuates the differences among the different social roles. These distinctive profiles, similar to distinctive personality profiles, could serve as informative variables for further study. For example, would more socially adept people be more accurate at identifying the distinctive profile of a given social role within their own culture? Cross-culturally, could the ability to accurately detect or enact distinctive behavioral profiles of social roles be an indicator of cultural competence?

Limitations and Future Directions

Issues of response style complicate cross-cultural comparisons of Likert-rated items (Costello, Wood, & Tov, 2018; Fischer & Poortinga, 2018; Heine, Lehman, Peng, & Greenholtz, 2002), making coding and qualitative analysis of open-ended responses an important source of data. However, it would be helpful to replicate these findings with complementary methods such as situation sampling (Buchtel & Guan, 2019; Morling, Uchida, & Frentrup, 2015).

By focusing on the relational features of closeness and status, we unexpectedly found stronger general effects of closeness than status in both cultures, despite the emphasis in Confucianism on role hierarchy (Hwang, 2012; Rosemont & Ames, 2016). This opens up interesting questions of whether relational distance places a boundary condition on the effects of status on behavior, or whether in general, ingroup/outgroup differences have a larger effect on behavior than status differences. Further studies that focus on these features of social relationship (closeness or relative status) are needed to accumulate research evidence.

Conclusion

By uniquely combining methodological frameworks from both personality psychology and pragmatics to analyze open-ended data, we find rich and revealing patterns of how social roles are expected to affect behavior across American and Chinese participants. The data suggests that reliable and sensible differences will emerge as interpersonal roles change along two dimensions of closeness and relative status, which should stimulate further study and theoretical explanation. Especially in contrast to the communications literature, there is a dearth of research in personality and social psychology on the effects of specific aspects of contextual situations (Guillaume, Stauner, & Funder, 2017; Pettigrew, 2018). More research is needed to further develop methods in psychology that focus on revealing specific injunctive norms associated with specific situations, and their effects on behavior.

The behavior of an individual is influenced by a combination of dispositional and contextual effects (Chiu, Gelfand, Yamagishi, Shteynberg, & Wan, 2010; Wood, 2007). Based on the evidence described here, it is likely that over and above individual and dyadic differences, on average more role-differentiated behavior would be observed in Chinese than American contexts. But, to emphasize the universal aspects, it is evident that dyadic closeness and relative status are salient, behavior-influencing contextual features in both of these cultures. Knowledge of how

injunctive norms for behavior are influenced by both culture and relational aspects of the situation is not only important for understanding how humans interact within our social worlds, but also for enhancing interpersonal interaction in our rapidly globalizing world (Kim, 2010).

References

Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2014). Communal and agentic content in social cognition: A dual perspective model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 50*, 195–255.

Biesanz, J. C. (2010). The social accuracy model of interpersonal perception: Assessing individual differences in perceptive and expressive accuracy. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *45*(5), 853–885. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2010.519262

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. London, England: Cambridge University Press.

Buchtel, E. E., & Guan, Y. (2019). *The morality of appropriate behavior: Role-switched behavior as perceived by Chinese and Americans*. Manuscript in preparation.

Buchtel, E. E., Guan, Y., Peng, Q., Su, Y., Sang, B., Chen, S. X., & Bond, M. H. (2015). Immorality East and West: Are immoral behaviors especially harmful, or especially uncivilized? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(10), 1382–1394.

Buchtel, E. E., Ng, L. C. Y., Norenzayan, A., Heine, S. J., Biesanz, J. C., Chen, S. X., … Su, Y. (2018). A sense of obligation: Cultural differences in the experience of obligation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218769610

Ching, C. M., Church, A. T., Katigbak, M. S., Locke, K. D., de Jesús Vargas-Flores, J., Ibáñez-Reyes, J., … Ortiz, F. A. (2013). Cross-cultural generalizability of the personality and role identity structural model (PRISM): Implications for trait and cultural psychology. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(6), 894–907. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.08.012

Chiu, C. Y., Gelfand, M. J., Yamagishi, T., Shteynberg, G., & Wan, C. (2010). Intersubjective culture: The role of intersubjective perceptions in cross-cultural research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(4), 482–493. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691610375562

Chuang, Y.-C. (1998). The cognitive structure of role norms in Taiwan. *Asian Journal of Social*

Psychology, *1*(3), 239–251. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00016

Church, A. T., Alvarez, J. M., Katigbak, M. S., Mastor, K. A., Cabrera, H. F., Tanaka-Matsumi, J., … Buchanan, A. L. (2012). Self-concept consistency and short-term stability in eight cultures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*(5), 556–570. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.06.003

Church, A. T., Katigbak, M. S., & del Prado, A. M. (2010). Cultural similarities and differences in perceived affordances of situations for Big Five behaviors. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(1), 78–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.11.003

Church, A. T., Willmore, S. L., Anderson, A. T., Ochiai, M., Porter, N., Mateo, N. J., … Ortiz, F. A. (2012). Cultural differences in implicit theories and self-perceptions of traitedness: Replication and extension with alternative measurement formats and cultural dimensions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *43*(8), 1268–1296. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111428514

Costello, C. K., Wood, D., & Tov, W. (2018). Revealed traits: A novel method for estimating cross-cultural similarities and differences in personality. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *49*(4), 554–586. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022118757914

English, T., & Chen, S. (2007). Culture and self-concept stability: Consistency across and within contexts among Asian Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*(3), 478–490.

Fischer, R., & Poortinga, Y. H. (2018). Addressing methodological challenges in culture-comparative research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *49*(5), 691–712. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022117738086

Funder, D. C. (2009). Persons, behaviors and situations: An agenda for personality psychology in the postwar era. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*(2), 120–126.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.041

Funder, D. C. (2016). Taking situations seriously: The situation construal model and the Riverside Situational Q-sort. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *25*(3), 203–208. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416635552

Furr, R. M. (2008). A framework for profile similarity: Integrating similarity, normativeness, and distinctiveness. *Journal of Personality*, *76*(5), 1267–1316. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00521.x

Guillaume, E., Baranski, E., Todd, E., Bastian, B., Bronin, I., Ivanova, C., … Funder, D. C. (2016). The world at 7:00: Comparing the experience of situations across 20 countries. *Journal of Personality*, *84*(4), 493–509. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12176

Guillaume, E., Stauner, N., & Funder, D. C. (2017). Toward a psychology of situations across cultures. In A.T. Church (Ed.), *Personality across Cultures* (pp. 309–334). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Heine, S. J., & Buchtel, E. E. (2009). Personality: The universal and the culturally specific. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 369–394. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163655

Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Peng, K., & Greenholtz, J. (2002). What's wrong with cross-cultural comparisons of subjective Likert scales? The reference-group effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(6), 903–918. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.903

Hwang, K.-K. (2012). *Foundations of Chinese psychology: Confucian social relations*. New York, NY: Springer.

Kanagawa, C., Cross, S. E., & Markus, H. R. (2001). "Who am I?" The cultural psychology of the conceptual self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(1), 90–103. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201271008

Kim, M.-S. (2010). Intercultural communication in Asia: Current state and future prospects. *Asian Journal of Communication*, *20*(2), 166–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292981003693351

Li, W.-Q., Li, L. M. W., & Li, M. (2018). Residential mobility reduces ingroup favouritism in prosocial behaviour. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12338

Locke, K. D., Church, A. T., Mastor, K. A., Curtis, G. J., Sadler, P., McDonald, K., … Ortiz, F. A. (2017). Cross-situational self-consistency in nine cultures: The importance of separating influences of social norms and distinctive dispositions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*(7), 1033–1049. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217704192

Malloy, T. E., Albright, L., Diaz-Loving, R., Dong, Q., & Lee, Y. T. (2004). Agreement in personality judgments within and between nonoverlapping social groups in collectivist cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*(1), 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203258863

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 224–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

McAuley, P. C., Bond, M. H., & Kashima, E. (2002). Toward defining situations objectively: A culture-level analysis of role dyads in Hong Kong and Australia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*(4), 363–379. https://doi.org/10.1177/00222102033004001

Moriizumi, S. (2016). What do I say next? Social status differences, self-construals, and partner's response messages in interpersonal conflict styles. *Japanese Journal of Communication Studies*, *45*(1), 71–91. https://doi.org/10.20698/comm.45.1_71

Morling, B., Uchida, Y., & Frentrup, S. (2015). Social support in two cultures: Everyday transactions in the U.S. and empathic assurance in Japan. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(6), e0127737.

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127737

Pettigrew, T. F. (2018). The Emergence of Contextual Social Psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *44*(7), 963–971. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218756033

Rauthmann, J. F. (2015). Structuring situational information: A road map of the multiple pathways to different situational taxonomies. *European Psychologist*, *20*(3), 176–189. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000225

Rauthmann, J. F. (2016). Motivational factors in the perception of psychological situation characteristics. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *10*(2), 92–108. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12239

Rauthmann, J. F., Gallardo-Pujol, D., Guillaume, E., Todd, E., Nave, C. S., Sherman, R. A., … Funder, D. C. (2014). The situational eight DIAMONDS: A taxonomy of major dimensions of situation characteristics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*(4), 677–718. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037250

Rauthmann, J. F., & Sherman, R. A. (2016). Measuring the Situational Eight DIAMONDS characteristics of situations: An optimization of the RSQ-8 to the S8. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *32*(2), 155–164. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000246

Rauthmann, J. F., & Sherman, R. A. (2017). Normative and distinctive accuracy in situation perceptions: Magnitude and personality correlates. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *8*(7), 768–779. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550616687095

Rogers, K. H., & Biesanz, J. C. (2015). Knowing versus liking: Separating normative knowledge from social desirability in first impressions of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *109*(6), 1105–1116. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039587

Rogers, K. H., Wood, D., & Furr, R. M. (2018). Assessment of similarity and self-other agreement in dyadic relationships: A guide to best practices. *Journal of Social and Personal*

Relationships, *35*(1), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517712615

Rosemont, H. J., & Ames, R. T. (2016). *Confucian role ethics: A moral vision for the 21st century?* Taipei, Taiwan: National Taiwan University Press.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (1996). Recognising Power and Distance. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *26*(95), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00047-X

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). Rapport management: A framework for analysis. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp. 11–46). London: Continuum.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *34*, 529–545. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00039-X

Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.). (2008). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication, and politeness theory* (2nd Ed.). London, England: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Spencer-Oatey, H., & Xing, J. (2004). Rapport management problems in Chinese–British business interactions: a case study. In J. House & J. Rehbein (Eds.), *Multilingual Communication* (pp. 197–221). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Suh, E. M. (2002). Culture, identity consistency, and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(6), 1378–1391.

Takano, Y., & Osaka, E. (2018). “Attention, please” to situation: Replies to commentaries by Uleman, Matsumoto, Hamamura and Takemura, and Vignoles. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *21*(4), 346–355. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12347

Wood, D. (2007). Using the PRISM to compare the explanatory value of general and role-contextualized trait ratings. *Journal of Personality*, *75*(6), 1103–1126. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00469.x

Table 1
Descriptive Data on Closeness and Equality of Dyads

			Closeness rating of Dyad		Equality rating of Dyad	
	Chinese N	American N	Chinese *M* (*SD*)	American *M* (*SD*)	Chinese *M* (*SD*)	American *M* (*SD*)
All 16 scenarios	*392*	*401*	*4.92 (1.45)*	*4.73 (1.58)*	*5.28 (1.37)*	*5.04 (1.79)*
Close-Equal roles						
Business partners	25	27	5.60 (0.91)	5.96 (0.94)	5.80 (1.22)	6.26 (0.90)
Graduate students (roommates)	23	25	5.52 (0.85)	6.08 (0.91)	5.87 (1.42)	6.56 (0.77)
Clerks (friends)	25	25	5.60 (1.12)	5.48 (0.87)	5.88 (1.01)	6.36 (0.91)
Old Classmates (friends)	25	25	5.64 (0.95)	5.56 (1.19)	5.48 (1.05)	6.44 (0.77)
Average of 4 scenarios	*98*	*102*	*5.59 (0.96)*	*5.77 (0.98)*	*5.76 (1.18)*	*6.40 (0.84)*
Close-High & Close-Low roles						
Father and son	27	23	5.63 (1.04)	5.65 (0.78)	5.00 (1.33)	5.04 (1.33)
Mother and daughter	25	26	6.48 (0.82)	5.64 (0.86)	5.44 (1.04)	4.38 (1.30)
Grandfather and grandson	26	24	5.54 (0.90)	6.08 (0.88)	4.54 (1.36)	4.42 (1.32)
Grandmother and granddaughter	26	24	6.08 (0.93)	5.54 (1.02)	4.88 (1.03)	4.50 (1.41)
Average of 4 scenarios	*104*	*97*	*5.93 (0.93)*	*5.73 (0.88)*	*4.97 (1.19)*	*4.59 (1.34)*
Distant-Equal roles						
Mid-level managers (different companies)	27	26	4.00 (1.11)	4.65 (1.62)	5.70 (1.10)	6.38 (0.90)
Policemen (new coworkers)	26	25	4.69 (1.38)	4.36 (1.29)	5.54 (1.17)	6.12 (1.05)
Shop workers (acquaintances)	21	25	4.48 (0.87)	3.64 (1.04)	5.48 (1.12)	6.08 (1.19)
Customers (strangers)	27	25	3.44 (1.45)	3.64 (1.38)	6.19 (1.00)	5.52 (1.29)
Average of 4 scenarios	*101*	*101*	*4.15 (1.20)*	*4.07 (1.33)*	*5.73 (1.10)*	*6.03 (1.11)*
Distant-High & Distant-Low roles						
Boss and secretary (different departments)	20	19	4.10 (1.12)	3.16 (1.12)	4.80 (1.67)	2.42 (1.17)

Professor and student (no direct working relationship)	18	31	4.56 (0.98)	2.90 (1.01)	4.50 (1.20)	2.84 (1.51)
Interviewer and job applicant	26	26	3.73 (1.31)	3.65 (1.26)	4.65 (1.55)	3.35 (1.16)
Factory boss and bus driver (strangers)	25	25	3.44 (1.47)	3.88 (1.76)	4.44 (1.80)	3.76 (1.81)
Average of 4 scenarios	*89*	*101*	*3.96 (1.22)*	*3.40 (1.29)*	*4.60 (1.56)*	*3.09 (1.41)*

Table 2
Similarity of Raw Role Profiles, within culture (Chinese: Upper-right; American: Lower-left).

Relationship / Role	Close			Distant		
	High status r [95% CIs]	Equal status r [95% CIs]	Low status r [95% CIs]	High status r [95% CIs]	Equal status r [95% CIs]	Low status r [95% CIs]
Close						
High Status	—	.28* [.017, .504].	.54*** [.329, .705]	-.04 [-.297, .227]	-.11 [-.361, .158]	-.21 [-.445, .059]
Equal Status	.44*** [.210, .621]	—	.36** [.108, .569]	.13 [-.140, .377]	.27* [.005, .495]	.11 [-.161, .358]
Low Status	.52*** [.312, .683]	.51*** [.300, .677]	—	-.14 [-.385, .131]	.04 [-.229, .296]	-.12 [-.366, .152]
Distant						
High Status	.11 [-.148, .349]	.39** [.150, .582]	.08 [-.175, .325]	—	.47*** [.213, .648].	62*** [.421, .755]
Equal Status	.17 [-.083, .406]	.45*** [.224, .630]	.25† [-.001, .473]	.71*** [.560, .816]	—	.48*** [.244, .656]
Low Status	.12 [-.136, .360]	.42*** [.191, .609]	.16 [-.091, .399]	.78*** [.653, .860]	.64*** [.465, .768]	—

Note. Within-culture Spearman's rho correlations between per-role raw profiles. Chinese data in upper-right corner; American data in lower-left corner. Correlations are across 56 codes for Chinese and 61 codes for American data.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 3
Similarity of Distinctive Role profiles, within culture (Chinese: Upper-right; American: Lower-left).

Relationship / Role	Close			Distant		
	High status	Equal status	Low status	High status	Equal status	Low status
	r [95% CIs]	*r* [95% CIs]	*r* [95% CIs]	*r* [95% CIs]	*r* [95% CIs]	*r* [95% CIs]
Close						
High Status	—	.11 [-.161, .358]	.40** [.155, .600]	-.52*** [-.688, -.298]	-.51*** [-.680, -.285]	-.62*** [-.757, -.424]
Equal Status	-.08 [-.321, .179]	—	.08 [-.189, .333]	-.22 [-.457, .044]	.03 [-.233, .291]	-.15 [-.399, .114]
Low Status	.30* [.055, .514]	.14 [-.115, .378]	—	-.67*** [-.792, -.493]	-.51*** [-.678, -.281]	-.51*** [-.681, -.286]
Distant						
High Status	-.49*** [-.659, -.271]	-.26* [-.481, -.010]	-.69*** [-.805, -.536]	—	.34** [.089, .555]	.62*** [.426, .758]
Equal Status	-.53*** [-.689, -.322]	-.004 [-.255, .248]	-.34** [-.543, -.095]	.37** [.130, .568]	—	.44** [.195, .626]
Low Status	-.64*** [-.769, -.466]	-.18 [-.416, .071]	-.48*** [-.643, -.244]	.55*** [.350, .706]	.22 [-.029, .450]	—

Note. Within-culture Spearman's rho correlations between per-role Distinctive profiles (after subtracting Normative profile). Chinese data in upper-right corner; American data in lower-left corner. Correlations are across 56 codes for Chinese and 61 codes for American data.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 4
Top 10 Most Normative and Most Role-Distinctive behaviors, per culture

Role	Behavior Categories
Chinese	
Normative	Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (12.16%); talk about work / school (7.57%); make small talk (6.58%); guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.) (5.46%); provide help (e.g., pour water, get utensils) (3.87%); serve food to the other (夹菜) (3.71%); talk about "how life is going" (3.42%); eat together (practical statement) (3.41%); Ask other's food/drink preference (2.97%); offer seat/invite to join (gesture of respect) (2.91%)
Distinctive	
Close	
High Status (200 examples)	*Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (-12.16%);* guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.) (9.54%); talk about work / school (6.93%); serve food to the other (夹菜) (6.29%); let other order (3.62%); talk about romantic relationship (3.59%); *eat together (practical statement) (-3.41%); make small talk (-3.08%); offer seat/invite to join (gesture of respect) (-2.41%); say thank you (-1.74%)*
Low Status (221 examples)	*Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (-12.16%);* serve food to the other (夹菜) (8.05%); provide help (e.g., pour water, get utensils) (7.44%); guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.) (6.75%); talk about health (6.16%); ask other's food/drink preference (5.62%); *talk about work / school (-5.31%)*; offer to pay the bill (3.43%); *eat together (practical statement) (-3.41%); make small talk (-3.41%)*
Equal Status (389 examples)	*Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (-10.37%)*; talk about work / school (5.29%); talk about "how life is going" (4.55%); *serve food to the other (夹菜) (-3.2%)*; *guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.) (-2.64%)*; reminisce (2.36%); provide help (e.g., pour water, get utensils) (2.04%); *ask for a seat (-1.71%); offer seat/invite to join (gesture of respect) (-1.62%);* say thank you (1.6%)

Distant	
High Status (152 examples)	Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (13.49%); offer seat/invite to join (gesture of respect) (4.99%); *guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.) (-4.81%);* ask for a seat (4.21%); *serve food to the other (夹菜) (-3.71%)*; do nothing/avoid interaction (3.65%); *provide help (e.g., pour water, get utensils) (-3.22%);* talk about formal business (2.52%); *order other's (favorite) food/drink (-1.77%); say thank you (-1.74%)*
Low Status (154 examples)	Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (12.51%); *talk about work / school (-6.27%); guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.) (-4.81%)*; eat together (practical statement) (4.38%); *serve food to the other (夹菜) (-3.71%); provide help (e.g., pour water, get utensils) (-3.23%); ask other's food/drink preference (-2.97%); talk about "how life is going" (-2.77%)*; be polite (2.13%); ask for advice / take advice (2.07%)
Equal Status (350 examples)	Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (8.69%); *guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.) (-4.03%); serve food to the other (夹菜) (-3.71%)*; get to know each other (3.13%); *talk about "how life is going" (-2.85%);* introduce oneself (2.83%); make small talk (2.57%); shake hands (2.55%); *provide help (e.g., pour water, get utensils) (-2.16%)*; give contact information to other (2.14%)
American	
Normative	Make small talk (8.68%); talk about work / school (7.24%); be respectful (5.57%); be polite (5.11%); minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (4.69%); be friendly / nice (3.93%); offer to pay the bill (3.81%); use relaxed body language / be casual / be informal (3.41%); talk about "how life is going" (3.08%); treat as equal / act normally (2.75%)
Distinctive	
Close	
High Status (262 examples)	Talk about work / school (9.17%); *minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (-4.31%); make small talk (-4.1%); be polite (-3.96%);* treat as equal / act normally (3.36%); give advice (3.35%); *be friendly / nice (-3.17%)*; offer to pay the bill (3.07%); tell other you are proud of him/her (2.86%); talk about romantic relationship (2.42%)
Low Status (262 examples)	Be respectful (7.79%); offer to pay the bill (7.65%); *talk about work / school (-4.95%); minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (-4.69%);* talk about "how life is going" (2.65%); *make small talk (-2.19%); be formal / professional (-2%);* ask for advice / take advice (1.85%); show kindness / treat with love (1.7%); *be friendly / nice (-1.64%)*

Equal Status (592 examples)	Talk about family/ friends (4.03%); *be respectful (-3.88%); be polite (-3.08%);* act happy / smile / laugh (2.48%); talk about "how life is going" (2.16%); make jokes / joke around (2.08%); *treat as equal / act normally (-1.91%);* make eye contact (1.71%); *offer to pay the bill (-1.44%); be formal / professional (-1.32%)*
Distant	
High Status (286 examples)	Be formal / professional (4.65%); make small talk (4.26%); *be respectful (-4.17%);* minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (3%); be polite (2.93%); use relaxed body language / be casual / be informal (2.88%); *offer to pay the bill (-2.41%); talk about ℓhow life is going"(-2.38%);* be friendly / nice (2.01%); *act happy / smile / laugh (-1.73%)*
Low Status (281 examples)	Be respectful (4.4%); be polite (4.15%); *offer to pay the bill (-3.81%); talk about family/ friends (-2.39%); talk about ℓhow life is going"(-2.37%); talk about work / school (-2.26%);* minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (2.07%); be formal / professional (1.92%); answer questions (1.46%); *act happy / smile / laugh (-1.37%)*
Equal Status (536 examples)	Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye) (3.89%); *offer to pay the bill (-3.06%); be respectful (-2.77%); talk about ℓhow life is going"(-2.33%); use relaxed body language / be casual / be informal (-2.3%);* get to know each other (2%); smile (unclassified) (2%); introduce oneself (1.86%); talk about the food/restaurant (1.73%); talk about other personal topics (e.g. future, background, share experience) (1.35%)

Note. For the Distinctive profiles, percentage values indicate the percentage of behaviors coded as such for the given social role category, after subtracting the normative profile; *italics* emphasize codes that appeared *less* often than they do in the Normative profile. The Top 10 Raw Profile percentages may be found in Online Table 3 at https://tinyurl.com/osf-supp-jccp2019 for comparison.

Appendix 1: Scenarios

Role types	Relationship	English scenario text	Chinese scenario text
Close-High & Close-Low	Father and son	Imagine a FATHER and his SON together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. The son is 25 years old and has a job.	试想一个父亲和儿子一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。儿子二十五岁有工作。
Close-High & Close-Low	Mother and daughter	Imagine a MOTHER and her DAUGHTER together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. The daughter is 25 years old and has a job.	试想一个母亲和女儿一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。女儿二十五岁有工作。
Close-High & Close-Low	Grandfather and grandson	Imagine a GRANDFATHER and his GRANDSON together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. The grandson is 25 years old and has a job.	试想祖父和孙子一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。孙子二十五岁有工作。
Close-High & Close-Low	Grandmother and granddaughter	Imagine a GRANDMOTHER and her GRANDDAUGHTER together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. The granddaughter is 25 years old and has a job.	试想祖母和孙女一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。孙女二十五岁有工作。
Distant-High & Distant-Low	Interviewer and job applicant	Imagine a female INTERVIEWER and a female JOB APPLICANT together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch at the same table after they had finished the interview. They were strangers before the interview and had to share a table together because there was a big crowd today.	试想一个面试官(女)和应聘者(女)在面试结束后在一间普通的餐厅里的同一张桌子上吃午饭。她们在面试前互不相识，因为餐厅太多人，她们才需要用同一张桌子。
Distant-High & Distant-Low	Boss and Secretary	Imagine a female department BOSS and a female SECRETARY (from another department) together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. They work in the same company and have seen each other before, but have had no direct working relationship, only indirect; they had to share a	试想一个部门主管(女)和另一个部门的秘书(女)一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。她们在同一间 公司工作而且互相见过对方，但是没有直接工作关系，只有间接的工作交流。因为餐厅里的人太多，所以她

		table together because there was a big crowd today.	们需要用同一张桌子。
Distant-High & Distant-Low	Factory boss and bus driver	Imagine a male FACTORY BOSS and a male BUS DRIVER together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch at the same table. They are strangers but had to share a table together because there was a big crowd today. They are adult and similar in age.	试想有一个工厂老板(男)和一个巴士司机(男)在一间普通的餐厅里的同一张桌子上吃午饭。他们互不相识，但是因为餐厅太多人，所以他们需要用同一张桌子。他们都是成年人并且年纪相近。
Distant-High & Distant-Low	Professor and graduate student	Imagine a male PROFESSOR and a male GRADUATE STUDENT (a student of another professor) together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. They work in the same school and have seen each other before, but they have no direct working relationship, only indirect; they had to share a table together because there was a big crowd today.	试想一个教授(男)和另一个教授指导的研究生(男)一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。他们在同一间学校工作而且互相见过对方，但是没有直接工作关系，只有间接的工作交流。因为餐厅里的人太多，所以他们需要用同一张桌子。
Close-Equal & Close-Equal	Old high school classmates	Imagine a female OLD HIGH SCHOOL CLASSMATE X and a female OLD HIGH SCHOOL CLASSMATE Y together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. They, who have similar age and jobs, were high school classmates and are good friends.	试想高中老同学甲(女)跟高中老同学乙(女)一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。她们年龄相近、有相同工作而且是高中同学以及好朋友。
Close-Equal & Close-Equal	Graduate students	Imagine a male GRADUATE STUDENT X and a male GRADUATE STUDENT Y together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. They, who are of similar age, are roommates and good friends.	试想研究生甲(男)跟研究生乙(男)一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。他们年纪相近，是舍友以及好朋友。
Close-Equal & Close-Equal	Clerks	Imagine a male OFFICE CLERK X and a male OFFICE CLERK Y together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. They, who have similar age and work experience, are good friends.	试想文员甲(男)跟文员乙(男)一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。他们年龄相近也有差不多的工作经验，而且是好朋友。

Close-Equal & Close-Equal	Business partners	Imagine a female BUSINESS PARTNER X and a female BUSINESS PARTNER Y together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. They, who have known each other and done business together for years, are good friends.	试想商业伙伴甲(女)跟商业伙伴乙(女)一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。他们相识、共事多年而且是好朋友。
Distant-Equal & Distant-Equal	Customers	Imagine a male CUSTOMER X and a male CUSTOMER Y together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch at the same table. They are strangers but had to share a table together because there was a big crowd today. They are adult and similar in age.	试想顾客甲(男)跟顾客乙(男)在一间普通的餐厅里的同一张桌子上吃午饭。他们互不相识，但是因为餐厅太多人，所以他们需要用同一张桌子。他们都是成年人并且年纪相近。
Distant-Equal & Distant-Equal	Mid-level managers	Imagine a female MID-LEVEL MANAGER X and a female MID-LEVEL MANAGER Y of different companies together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together after a meeting. They, who are similar in age and work experience, just met each other for the first time.	试想两名在不同公司工作的中层管理者甲(女)跟中层管理者乙(女)在会议后一起在一间普通的餐厅里吃午饭。她们有着相近的年龄和工作经验。这是她们第一次见面。
Distant-Equal & Distant-Equal	Policemen	Imagine a POLICEMAN X and a POLICEMAN Y together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch together. They, who are similar in age and work experience, were working together for the first time and didn't know each other before.	试想警察甲(男)跟警察乙(男)一起在一间普通的餐厅吃午饭。他们有着相近的年龄和工作经验。他们以往是不相识的，这次是他首次一起工作。
Distant-Equal & Distant-Equal	Shop workers	Imagine a female SHOP WORKER X and a female SHOP WORKER Y together in a casual restaurant, eating lunch at the same table. They had to share a table together because there was a big crowd today. They, who are similar in age and work experience, worked in different stores and are only acquaintances.	试想店员甲(女)跟店员乙(女)在一间普通的餐厅里的同一张桌子上吃午饭。因为餐厅里的人太多,所以她们需要共享一张桌子。她们有着相近的年龄和工作经验。她们在不同的商店工作，只是面熟。

Appendix 2: Example Normative, Raw and Distinctive profile similarity analysis

Behavior Code category	(a) PRC Normative profile[a]	PRC Close, High status		PRC Distant, Equal status	
		(b) Raw profile[b]	(c) Distinctive profile[c]	(d) Raw profile	(e) Distinctive profile
Minimal interaction (greet / nod and smile/ say goodbye)	12.16%	0.00%	-12.16%	20.90%	8.69%
Guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.)	5.46%	15.00%	9.54%	1.40%	-4.03%
Talk about work / school	7.57%	14.50%	6.93%	8.60%	1%
Serve food to the other (夹菜)	3.71%	10.00%	6.29%	0.00%	-3.71%
Let other order	0.88%	4.50%	3.62%	0.30%	-0.6%
Talk about romantic relationship	0.91%	4.50%	3.59%	0.00%	-0.91%
Eat together (practical statement)	3.41%	0.00%	-3.41%	5.10%	1.73%
Make small talk	6.58%	3.50%	-3.08%	9.10%	2.57%
Offer seat/invite to join (gesture of respect)	2.91%	0.50%	-2.41%	3.40%	0.52%
Say thank you	1.74%	0.00%	-1.74%	3.10%	1.4%
Order other 's (favorite) food/drink	1.77%	3.50%	1.73%	0.00%	-1.77%
Get to know each other	1.73%	0.00%	-1.73%	4.90%	3.13%
Ask for a seat	1.71%	0.00%	-1.71%	3.70%	2%
Order food/drink	1.29%	3.00%	1.71%	0.60%	-0.72%
Give advice	0.81%	2.50%	1.69%	0.00%	-0.81%
...[continues for remaining codes]	…	…	…	…	…

Note. Codes are displayed in order of the Distinctive profile of the Close, High status actors in the Chinese (PRC) data; see Online Table 2 at https://tinyurl.com/osf-supp-jccp2019 for remaining codes, roles, and USA data. Example research questions illustrated by this data: Q: In the PRC data, how similar is the Raw behavioral profile of Close, High status roles (e.g. a grandmother who is eating with her granddaughter) to the profile of Distant, Equal status roles (e.g. a stranger who is eating with another stranger of similar social status)? A: Neither highly dissimilar nor similar; the Raw role profiles (b and d) are non-significantly correlated, $r_s(56) = -0.11$ (see Table 2). Q: Do their distinctive profiles make their similarities / dissimilarities more clear? A: Yes; their Distinctive role profiles (c and e) are highly dissimilar, i.e. negatively correlated at $r_s(56) = -0.51$, $p < .001$ (see Table 3). Similarity of profiles is assessed by Spearman's Rho (rank correlations) calculated across the 56 behavior codes that occurred 3 or more times in the PRC data.

[a] Normative profile code frequencies are calculated per-culture, as the average percentage across the 6 role types for each behavior code in that culture.

[b] Raw profile frequencies for each code are calculated as the percentage of behaviors provided by participants for the given role within the given culture. For example, the behavior of the Close-High status role was described by 104 PRC participants reading about one of four Close, High-status role actors (see Appendix 1 for scenarios) who wrote down 200 different appropriate behaviors in total; 30 of these behaviors were coded as "Guanxin (show care by advising, reminding, etc.)" resulting in a raw percentage of 15% for that code.

[c] Distinctive profile code frequencies are calculated as the Raw profile's code percentage minus the Normative profile's code percentage for that culture.